

*Patent Application Serial No. 10/568,416*

**REMARKS**

Claim 7 is canceled without prejudice to reentry, claim 1 is amended, and new claims are added.

The amendment is supported in canceled claim 7, the drawing, and the specification paragraph at page 7, line 16, reading, "... These clips 80, 80 and 81, 81 ... function as holding members for *sandwiching* the periphery of the fixed substrate 130" (emphasis added). New claim 10 is similarly supported. New claim 11 is supported at page 9, lines 2-3. The new claims are patentable for the reasons below.

In response to the outstanding Action:

(1-2) On page 4, claims 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 (apparently, actually §103) as being anticipated by (apparently, obvious over) Furuhashi et al., US 2002/0000979 in view of Noda et al., JP 9-050731. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

**Holding Members.** The Examiner applies Furuhashi for anticipating the holding members of claim 1 (Action page 4, line 10) but does not give any reference numeral; at page 4, line 16, the Examiner lists several reference numerals without, however, making any assignment. Regardless of which element the Examiner intended, the rejection asserts that Furuhashi discloses the claimed holding member.

However, in the Response to Arguments, the Examiner states that "*Takashi* teaches U-shaped holding members (... item 13)" (page 2, lines 6-7; emphasis added) and, five lines further on, reverts and states that "The conductive paste and the double-sided tape of Furuhashi make up the holding member ..." Thus, the Applicant is uncertain what, exactly, is asserted as the prior-art holding member.

*Patent Application Serial No. 10/568,416*

In the rejection of claim 4 (discussed below), the Examiner states that “Takashi teaches holding plates” (the Applicant claims no “holding plate”) and also states that it would have been obvious to “modify Furuhashi with Takashi because ... using the holding *members* provide [attachment]” (emphasis added). In the following paragraph, starting on line 13, the Examiner cites Nagahata for “grooves for the holding members,” and these grooves contain clips somewhat like those of Takashi; this further hints that Takashi is relied upon for disclosing the claimed holding members, which implies that Furuhashi is not, and has none.

With respect, the rejection confuses elements. If Furuhashi already has a holding member, then what is being applied from Takashi? Is it the not-recited “holding plate” or the subsequently-recited “holding member” which apparently belongs to Takashi and not to Furuhashi (lines 10-12)?

The Examiner is requested to clarify just who discloses the claimed holding member, who teaches modifying it, and how it is asserted to be modified.

If it is the case that the dabs of conductive paste (8CH, 8DH) are being relied upon, the Applicant reasserts that its holding member has a completely different structure from the dabs of Furuhashi, and that neither reference discloses an element corresponding to the claimed holding member.

The Applicant also notes that modifying a dab of paste according to a metal clip would be like modifying ice cream according to a pair of pliers—that is, very unlikely to be undertaken by one of ordinary skill in the art.

**Terminals.** In rejecting claim 1, the Examiner relies on Noda for elements 4a-4d in Fig. 2, which the Examiner asserts against the claimed lead-out terminals on both substrates. In the

*Patent Application Serial No. 10/568,416*

Request For Review submitted with the Notice of Allowance, the Applicant had argued that “only the substrate 2 [of Furuhashi] possesses such terminals; Furuhashi’s upper substrate 1 lacks them. Therefore, the reference does not anticipate the Applicant’s feature: ‘a plurality of lead-out terminals ... extending to the peripheral edges of the first substrate *and* the second substrate.’”

With respect, the Examiner’s application of Noda does not rebut this argument, because Noda (like Furuhashi) fails to disclose lead-out terminals on *two* substrates (upper and lower). The Examiner asserts (page 4, last lines) that Noda teaches terminals on “the first substrate and the second substrate,” but this appears to be incorrect. There would be no reason to place lead-out terminals on the *other* substrate of Furuhashi, based on the teaching of Noda, especially because Noda’s asserted terminals are also on the lower substrate, like those of Furuhashi, and the two references appear to be analogous to one another.

(3) Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Furuhashi in view of Takashi, JP 200187237, and Nagahata, JP 09 045348, newly applied.

The Examiner previously took Official Notice of the grooves recited in claim 4, but now has cited a reference, as requested, for which the Examiner is thanked. The Examiner applies item 10 in Fig. 4 of Nagahata against the grooves. (The Applicant believes that numeral 10 actually references a metal clip (see Fig. 5), and that the Examiner means the slot in which the clip 10 is held.) The rejection is traversed because the slots of Fig. 4 are not slots in a transparent substrate as claimed, they are slots in a piece 8 that is *assembled to* a transparent substrate 2; the transparent substrate 2 itself lacks any slots or grooves. The cross hatching of the pieces 2 and 8 in Fig. 3 is believed to indicate that piece 2 is transparent and piece 8 is not.

*Patent Application Serial No. 10/568,416*

(4) Claims 8 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Furuhashi in view of Takashi. This rejection is respectfully traversed on the grounds above and of record.

The Remarks of July 15, 2009 are incorporated and respectfully repeated by reference.

Allowance is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

KRATZ, QUINTOS & HANSON, LLP

*Nick Bromer*

Nick S. Bromer  
Attorney for Applicant  
Reg. No. 33,478

NSB/lrj  
Suite 400  
1420 K Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
(202) 659-2930

23850

PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE

*I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the Patent and Trademark Office (Fax No. (571-273-8300) on February 11, 2010.*

Nick Bromer (reg. no. 33,478)

Signature

*Nick Bromer*

060118 ReOpened Amendment.wpd